

**BY ORDER OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE**

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 13-219

1 OCTOBER 1998



Space, Missile, Command, and Control

***SPECIAL TACTICS OPERATOR STANDARDS
AND EVALUATION PROGRAM***

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the SAF/AAD WWW site at: <http://afpubs.hq.af.mil>. If you lack access, contact your Publishing Distribution Office (PDO).

OPR: 720 STG/DOCV
(MSgt Timothy A. Wilkinson)
Supersedes AFI 13-219, 1 November 1996

Certified by: 720 STG/CC (Col James L. Oeser)

Pages: 16
Distribution: F

This instruction implements AFD 13-2, *Air Traffic Control, Airspace, and Range Management*. It establishes and defines the Standards and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) program for all Special Tactics units and combat control personnel assigned AETC instructor duty. It applies specifically to combat control and pararescue operators assigned to these units. Supplements to this instruction will be submitted to HQ 720th Special Tactics Group (AFSOC) for coordination before implementation. This instruction applies to all MAJCOM gained ANG combat control units when published in ANG IND 2.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This document is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed.

This instruction has gone through some major changes primarily in the Core Evaluation area (**Chapter 3**). It will require a thorough and comprehensive review by all Special Tactics personnel.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. General. The Special Tactics Standards and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Program exists to provide a method of quality control in a force which maintains a myriad of skills and qualifications. The philosophy is simple: a structured program, with clear defined guidelines and division of responsibilities, builds in quality. A commanders program, Stan/Eval relies on the coordinated efforts of personnel at all levels. At the heart of the program is the supervisor. The supervisor is the functional expert from whom the trainee receives his knowledge, work ethic, and leadership skills. Supervisors build the foundation which the trainee will use during his career. A strong and positive relationship between supervisor and trainee ensures a quality force. Stan/Eval is a total concept in which everyone is responsible for maintaining standards. Objective evaluations are a method of checks and balances. Utilizing and reinforcing the OJT program achieves program support from Air Force-level downwards and avoids making policies and procedures that do not correlate with Air Force training principles. The Special Tactics Stan/Eval Program provides an indicator of training effectiveness and unit capability. The program also ensures assigned operators are capable of performing duties in support of the unit's Mission Essential Task List (METL). Specific objectives include:

- 1.1.1. Ensuring continuity of METL capability by establishing inter-command standards.
- 1.1.2. Providing a system to assess both individual and unit proficiency levels.
- 1.1.3. Recommending improvements to training programs, lesson plans, standard operating procedures, and directives based on evaluation results.
- 1.1.4. Providing after action review feedback to senior, lateral, and subordinate headquarters through cross-command,
cross-tell reports.

1.2. Program Structure. The operator Stan/Eval program works in conjunction with the Air Force OJT system. In short, the supervisor trains or selects a trainer, the trainer accomplishes the training, and an evaluator certifies that the trainee is capable of performing the task. Following this principle, trainers certified in a specific task (not AFSC dependent) can provide training whether at home station, during a deployment, or at any other time considered conducive to training. Trainers as an integral part of the Stan/Eval, shape and provide objectivity to the program. Evaluations standardize procedures and ensure a capable force. In essence, when using the OJT system in conjunction with Stan/Eval, more effective training can be conducted in different locations and more trainers and evaluators are available to train and evaluate, this results in a better trained combat force. In order for the evaluations to be effective and objective, the system relies (when possible) on evaluation from outside the immediate chain of command. This provides checks and balances and precludes self evaluation. Using Air Force OJT guidance, an individual will not receive an evaluation from the task trainer. Supplemental procedures beyond the scope of the standard OJT profile are implemented using specific command guidance.

Chapter 2

ORGANIZATION

2.1. Commander Responsibilities. While a commander has many responsibilities, one of the most critical is the development and maintenance of a mission-ready force. A solid foundation of operating procedures, job knowledge, and skills are essential to training and mission accomplishment. The Stan/Eval mission is the development of standards and evaluations that help the commander implement force readiness and make accident prevention a systemic and routine entity in the performance of day-to-day mission tasks.

2.1.1. Commanders at each level will comply with the policies and intent of this instruction, ensure that safety is not compromised, and monitor standards and evaluations to ensure the program is both aggressively and realistically designed and executed.

2.1.2. Commanders must appoint trainers and certifiers and ensure the requirements of AFI 36-2201, Developing, Managing, and Conducting Training, are met.

2.2. MAJCOM Responsibilities. Each respective MAJCOM Stan/Eval function is responsible for the overall management and administration of the command Stan/Eval program. The ultimate goal is to ensure that units receive the necessary guidance, policies, and procedures required to enhance and maintain a mission-ready force. Towards this objective, a MAJCOM Stan/Eval section must be aware of their decisions and the limitations they may place on a unit's resources. Command responsibilities:

2.2.1. Review and maintain evaluation publications and supplements.

2.2.2. Set up and conduct command Stan/Eval programs.

2.2.3. Supervise the Stan/Eval functions in gained units of Air Reserve Forces to ensure the unit's program is in compliance with the gaining command's Stan/Eval program.

2.2.4. Establish procedures and requirements consistent with command METL to evaluate training programs and capabilities of assigned operators.

2.2.5. Ensure continuity of METL capability by establishing standard operating procedures for inter-command qualification and evaluation.

2.2.6. Ensure evaluation and after action data is analyzed semi-annually at unit level to identify significant trends.

2.3. MAJCOM Evaluators.

2.3.1. MAJCOM evaluators are responsible for identifying both positive and negative factors in the Stan/Eval program. Identification drives the acquisition of new or improved equipment and helps establish improved upgrade techniques or training procedures.

2.3.2. Conduct observation visits to subordinate units when directed. Debrief commander and prepare a written report of observations for each evaluation conducted. Commander's comments will be included in the report.

2.3.3. Maintain the highest proficiency possible and train with field units whenever possible.

2.3.4. Receive evaluations from any qualified evaluator IAW AF OJT system.

2.3.5. Ensure all operators, not attached to a subordinate unit within respective MAJCOM, are in compliance with this directive.

2.3.6. Augment respective MAJCOM inspector general (IG) team as required.

2.4. Unit Stan/Eval Responsibilities. Unit Stan/Eval programs help the commander, supervisors, trainers, certifiers, and trainees fulfill their duties.

2.4.1. The Stan/Eval Monitor. The Stan/Eval Monitor serves as the commander's focal point in ensuring a viable Stan/Eval program. While this individual has direct access to the commander, they can function at any level. This individual should be highly trained and proficient in ST skills, but it is not a necessity that they be qualified in all aspects. The Stan/Eval Monitor relies upon trained evaluators and trainers to perform the bulk of the duties and may delegate other duties as deemed necessary, but not the responsibility. Because this individual has primary oversight of the Stan/Eval program, they are required to be qualified as an evaluator or certifier.

2.4.1.1. Work directly for, and inform, the commander of factors adversely affecting operational capability and

recommend corrective action.

2.4.1.2. Ensure compliance with governing guidance on AF OJT documentation and procedures.

2.4.1.3. Analyze evaluation data semi-annually for adverse trends and recommend corrective action. Submit a copy of analysis to MAJCOM Stan/Eval.

2.4.1.4. Ensure a unit IG cross-tell information system is maintained.

2.4.1.5. Ensure appropriate reference material is available.

2.4.1.6. Recommend improvements to unit operations and procedures.

2.4.1.7. Evaluate METL and advanced skill qualifications through the use of spot evaluations.

2.4.1.8. Provide feedback to commander on effectiveness of unit training programs.

2.4.1.9. Approve employment evaluation scenarios to meet unit METL requirements.

2.4.2. Unit Evaluators. Quality evaluation begins by selecting people who have a higher degree of experience and by separating training and evaluation functions. By separating the training and evaluation functions, consistency and objectivity are gained. Evaluators are individuals who have received training in an AF task certifier course and are trained to conduct task evaluations in which they are qualified. Commanders formally appoint task certifiers by letter and ensure they are trained and certified to effectively evaluate and certify training. Evaluators will be certified annually on an AF Form 1098, Special Task Certification and Recurring Training.

2.4.2.1. Ensure individuals maintain established standards of proficiency through evaluation and observation.

2.4.2.2. Submit proposed evaluation scenarios to the Stan/Eval Monitor.

2.4.2.3. Develop and recommend improvements for unit operations and procedures.

2.4.2.4. Evaluate METL and advanced skill qualifications through the use of spot evaluations.

2.4.2.5. Evaluate effectiveness of unit training programs.

2.4.2.6. Provide feedback to examinee on the results of the evaluation.

2.4.3. Unit Trainers. The trainer (usually the supervisor) is the front-line operator and, as such, is an integral part of Stan/Eval. Quality training begins by selecting the right people for the right job. Trainers should be experienced in the tasks they teach and able to effectively train others. Commanders, with the help of experienced NCOs, formally appoint trainers by letter and ensure they are trained and certified to train. Trainers will be certified annually on an AF Form 1098.

2.4.3.1. Use METL; Tasks, Conditions, and Standards (TCS); and other unit-identified tasks to prepare and instruct the

trainee in the skills necessary to conduct the unit's missions.

2.4.3.2. Submit proposed training plans and schedules for approval.

2.4.3.3. Recommend improvements for unit operations and procedures.

2.4.3.4. Provide feedback to the trainee on the results of the training conducted.

2.4.4. Trainee. Perhaps the most important member of the Stan/Eval program is the trainee. Trainee's exist at all levels and are an indicator of all the units' processes. With few exceptions, the trainee reflects the level of instruction and the quality of the unit. The trainee is responsible for active participation in the learning process, this is necessary for the trainee to become a productive member of the team.

2.4.4.1. Give the trainer or supervisor feedback on the training you receive.

2.4.4.2. Ensure that feedback is received from the trainer and evaluator and that you understand your responsibilities.

Chapter 3

EVALUATIONS

3.1. Evaluations. Evaluations ensure that Special Tactics personnel are trained to achieve and maintain the qualifications and capability to safely and effectively accomplish their assigned mission. Evaluations should focus on the unit's METL tasks that are most likely to occur. The remaining evaluations should be related to tasks required for upgrade or special mission qualification/s.

3.2. Core Evaluations. Core evaluations are given every 18 months to evaluate those core skills necessary to remain proficient in assigned tasks. Operators who are operationally deployed when due for Stan/Eval will maintain currency until returning to home station as approved by the commander. The minimum core evaluation consists of closed book examination, physical fitness evaluation, and an employment evaluation. Each of these evaluations provide a "snapshot" as to an individual's level of fitness and competency at a particular time. Used in conjunction with spot evaluations, they can give a supervisor or commander an objective perspective on the individual and the training process.

3.2.1. Closed Book Examinations. Not every qualification or skill can be evaluated, but closed book examinations help round-out the total evaluation process. Closed-book exams should be oriented to areas important to the safe conduct of operations and the individual's total knowledge.

3.2.1.1. The 720 STG will develop and publish a closed book examination with a minimum of 25 questions. Unit Stan/Eval monitors will supplement this test with 10 questions from unit METLs. The requirements for closed-book evaluations are questions on:

3.2.1.1.1. Emergency and safety related procedures.

3.2.1.1.2. ATC or Rescue Medicine.

3.2.1.1.3. Unit METLs.

3.2.1.1.4. Special mission or advanced skill qualification.

3.2.1.2. Examinations are "controlled test material" and the unit evaluators are responsible for the integrity of the examination.

3.2.1.3. The minimum passing score is 75 percent. Incorrect answers will be reviewed after grading.

3.2.1.4. The Stan/Eval Monitor will keep the tests for a minimum of 18 months from completion.

3.2.1.5. Failures will retest within 60 calendar days. The commander will determine operational taskings. Individuals who fail a second time will not perform operational taskings and will be recommended for review board action.

3.2.2. Physical Training Test (PT Test). Total fitness for combat includes both physical fitness and mental fitness, if either attribute is lacking, combat effectiveness suffers proportionately. The capacity for skillful and sustained performance and the ability to rapidly recover from exertion is important to successfully accomplish Special Tactics missions. The PT Test is an easily attainable program that may be given at a wide variety of locations and simulates a variety of physical tasks. Each member will be administered a PT Test consisting of the exercises shown in figure 3.1. The recommended order for conducting the evaluation is as follows: chin-ups, sit-ups, push-ups, 3 mile run, and 1500 meter swim. Calisthenics events will be tested one right after the other with approximately a 2 minute

time lapse between events. Upon completion of all the calisthenics events, a 10 minute rest period is given prior to starting the 3-mile run. Upon completion of the 3-mile run, a 30 minute rest period is given prior to starting the 1500M swim.

3.2.2.1. To pass the PT Test successfully, an individual must meet the requirements for all events. Failure to meet physical fitness standard for any one event constitutes failure of entire test.

3.2.2.2. PT Test Procedures.

3.2.2.2.1. Chin/Pull-ups (two minute time limit). This exercise is executed on a pull-up bar. The individual grasps the bar with the hands about shoulder width apart. This is a two-count exercise. The exercise begins in the "dead hang" position. Count one: pull the body directly upward until the chin is over the bar. Count two: lower the body until the body is again in the "dead hang" position. Individuals will not swing excessively or bicycle feet as the chin is pulled over the bar. Repeat as many times as possible. Designed to measure strength and endurance in the back, triceps, and biceps muscles used when performing specific mission tasks.

3.2.2.2.2. Sit-ups (four minute time limit). Starting position: back flat on the ground, hands on the head, head off the ground and knees bent at approximately a 90 degree angle. Another individual during the exercise holds the feet (optional). This is a two-count exercise. Count one: sit up until the back is vertical to the ground. Count two: return to the starting position. There is no authorized rest position. If an individual raises buttocks from ground or removes hands from the head during a repetition, the repetition is not counted. Designed to measure strength and endurance in abdominal and hip flexor muscle groups used when performing specific mission tasks.

3.2.2.2.3. Push-ups (two minute time limit). This exercise starts from the front leaning rest position. The body must be maintained straight from head to heels with knees together. This is a two-count exercise. Count one: flex the elbows, lowering the body until the chest barely touches the fist of the counter. Count two: raise the body until the elbows are straight and locked. Repeat this exercise as many times as possible. Event is stopped when individual lifts an arm or leg or touches a knee. The only authorized rest position is the starting position. Designed to measure the strength and endurance of the chest and triceps muscles used when performing specific mission tasks.

3.2.2.2.4. Three Mile Run. Performed with running shoes and running shorts. Designed to measure aerobic endurance used when performing mission tasks, specifically employment or evasion situations.

3.2.2.2.5. 1500 Meter Swim. The swim will be performed with swim trunks, face mask or goggles (snorkel optional), and fins using any stroke. If swim is performed in open water, a life preserver or flotation device must be worn and 10 minutes will be added to maximum times in figure 3.1. Designed to measure aerobic endurance in a maritime environment.

3.2.2.3. Grading. Exercise, run, and swim times will be rounded off to lower point value. A composite score will determine the overall score.

3.2.2.4. Substandard Performance. Individuals who fail will be entered into a supervised remedial PT program and reevaluated within 60 calendar days. Individuals must complete an entire PT evaluation when retested. Operational taskings will be determined by the commander. Individu-

als who fail a second time will not perform operational taskings and will be recommended for review board action.

Figure 3.1. Physical Fitness Evaluation Criteria.

EXERCISE (Count)

PUSH UP	SIT UP	CHIN UP	3 MILE RUN	1500 METER SWIM
(2)	(2)	(2)		
85	100	16 = 100	20:00 = 200	26:00 = 200
80	95	15 = 90	20:30 = 190	27:00 = 190
75	90	14 = 80	21:00 = 180	28:00 = 180
70	85	13 = 75	21:30 = 170	29:00 = 170
65	80	12 = 70	22:00 = 160	30:00 = 160
60	75	11 = 65	22:30 = 150	31:00 = 150
55	70	10 = 60	23:00 = 140	32:00 = 140
50	65	9 = 55	23:30 = 130	33:00 = 130
45	60	8 = 50	24:00 = 120	34:00 = 120 under 30
40	55	7 = 45	25:00 = 110	34:30 = 110 30 and over:
35	50	6 = 40	26:00 = 100	35:00 = 100 40 and over

Note: (2) - indicates two count exercise

Underlined items - indicate age bracket, i.e., under 30, 30 and over, 40 and over

RATING SCALE

565-685	OUTSTANDING
435-560	EXCELLENT
325-430	SATISFACTORY

3.2.3. Employment Evaluation. The employment phase is the most important Stan/Eval evaluation. Scenarios should be conducted to evaluate as many of the unit's combat tasks as possible, to include air, land, and sea environments. Operators should deploy with the necessary equipment to perform a tactical profile. Tactical profiles should include practice or rehearsal in the related tactics and procedures which are common to, and directly associated with the planning, preparation, insertion, execution, and extraction phases of a tactical operation. Joint operations should be included when practical, as well as, evaluation sites that are not normally used for routine proficiency training. The operator/s

employment evaluation determines an individual's ability to function within a tactical environment, in a position commensurate with rank and unit position. It is also the primary means for commanders to internally evaluate an operator/s ability to accomplish assigned missions.

3.2.3.1. The employment will consist of at least a mission briefing, equipment preparation, insertion, tactical event, and a debriefing.

3.2.3.2. Employment evaluations may be conducted during scheduled exercises with the prior concurrence of exercise

planners. Evaluators should not be included in the tactical scenario.

3.2.3.3. At least one evaluator is recommended for every six operators being evaluated. Evaluators will grade personnel on their individual assignments during the team employment.

3.2.3.4. Inability to complete the insertion because of weather, aircraft cancellation, or other uncontrollable circumstances will not result in failure of the employment. The employment may be evaluated as long as the briefing was completed, the insertion was attempted, tactical event completed, and a debriefing was conducted.

3.2.3.5. Grading. Employment evaluations are graded pass or fail.

3.2.3.5.1. Substandard Performance. The evaluator will critique errors, incorrect procedures, and minor safety violations after the debriefing. A major safety violation is grounds for failure and will be corrected on the spot. Annotate areas requiring improvement and corrective action to be performed. Individuals who fail will be readministered the evaluation within 60 calendar days. Failure of an individual does not result in failure of the entire evaluation group.

3.2.3.5.2. Follow-up. Individuals who fail the employment phase of evaluation may only be tasked in support of a training mission under direct supervision of a qualified and current individual. Operational and contingency tasking of these individuals require a waiver from the appropriate authority. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring individuals are afforded adequate training opportunities to reach the standard. Individuals who fail a second time will be recommended for review board action.

3.3. Initial Evaluation. An initial evaluation is required for all newly assigned personnel. The majority of training has been completed in the specific Air Force Specialty course curriculum, but additional training may be required before assuming operational duties. The initial evaluation will consist of the core evaluations:

3.3.1. Closed Book Evaluation. Conducted IAW paragraph [3.2.1.](#)

3.3.2. Physical Fitness Evaluation. Conducted IAW paragraph [3.2.2.](#)

3.3.3. Employment Evaluation. Conducted IAW paragraph [3.2.3.](#)

3.4. Requalification Evaluation. Individuals who fail a core evaluation require a requalification evaluation. The individual will receive training and be recommended for requalification evaluation by his supervisor within 60 calendar days. The operator will complete the portion of the core evaluation he failed, i.e. closed book evaluation, PT etc.

3.5. Spot Evaluations. Spot evaluations are used to provide feedback to an individual's supervisor or trainer on the task competency of that individual and the effectiveness of a supervisor's or trainer's program. Additionally, spot evaluations are used as a method of providing the commander feedback on an individual's advanced skills or a specific team's mission capabilities through random evaluations of mission training and exercises. They may be conducted at any time. Personnel or teams receiving spot evaluations must be notified prior to the start of the mission briefing. Areas found to be substandard will result in decertification with additional training required prior to requalification.

3.6. Trainer and Evaluator Evaluations. Trainers and evaluators are evaluated on their effectiveness to train or evaluate, as well as, their ability to perform in their primary specialty. Trainers and evaluators are the key members of the training program. The ability to effectively train or evaluate others is a skill and, as such, may be evaluated like any other skill.

3.6.1. Unit Stan/Eval Monitors will ensure all trainers and evaluators are evaluated on an 18-month recurring basis.

3.6.2. MAJCOM or group level evaluators may evaluate a random sampling of subordinate unit's members when directed by the MAJCOM Operations directorate.

3.7. Administration of Evaluations. A sound and practical evaluation program is a prerequisite for effective evaluation. Evaluators must have the judgment necessary to meet unexpected or induced emergencies and the ability to exercise judgment through mature realization of their own and their trainee's limitations. An evaluator's familiarity with the concepts of tactical employment and sound judgment are critical factors to proper assessment of performance.

3.7.1. All evaluations resulting in task decertification must be in compliance with AF OJT guidance.

3.7.2. Evaluators will not evaluate personnel they have trained except in extreme circumstances.

3.7.3. An evaluation will not be changed to a training mission to avoid recording unsatisfactory performance, or a scheduled training mission, to an evaluation, to record satisfactory performance.

3.8. Failure of Evaluation. Individuals who fail a core evaluation require a requalification evaluation.

3.8.1. Failure of Requalification Evaluation. If designated as a core task required to maintain mission-ready status, failure will result in a recommendation for review board action.

3.9. Evaluation Briefings and Debriefings. Briefing and debriefing are critical aspects not only in missions, but in a proper Stan/Eval program as well. Evaluators will brief and debrief examinees on all aspects of evaluations. The evaluator will ensure examinees understand what is to be evaluated and the parameters of the evaluation. During debriefs, the evaluator will ensure the examinee understands all comments or remarks. Attendance of the examinee's supervisor is recommended during the debrief. When debriefing, each person should be given an opportunity to contribute their comments, observations, and recommendations. Conducting a proper debrief allows maximum benefit from the information collected and may be used to identify excellence or deficiencies in a training segment. Training records and documentation are an important part of the debrief process.

3.10. Documentation Procedures. Documentation is a performance indicator not only of the trainee, but the supervisor, trainer, and evaluator. Concise and factual documentation provides a history of tasks

accomplished and the conditions in which they were accomplished. Improper or sloppy documentation results in a poor or incomplete picture of the individual and should not be tolerated.

3.10.1. AF Form 623, On-the-Job Training Record. The AF Form 623 maintains basic source documents to provide a current history of each operator's qualifications. An AF Form 623 is established for each operator assigned to the unit and must be maintained IAW published guidance. Maintain AF Form 623 in a location readily accessible to supervisors, trainers, evaluators, and the individual members.

3.10.2. AF Form 803, Report of Task Evaluation. The AF Form 803 is used to record an evaluation in brief and concise statements and is maintained in the individual's AF Form 623. All entries must be legible and initialed by the trainee and evaluator in order to be considered valid. Self explanatory blocks are not addressed. When additional comments are required, they are referenced and filed with the original AF Form 803 on an AF Form 623a, On-the-Job Training Record Continuation Sheet.

3.10.3. Job Qualification Standard Task Items Evaluated. Write in the appropriate type of evaluation (initial, recurring, requalification, or spot), reference if applicable, and task evaluated.

3.10.3.1. Remarks. Fill in a concise and factual history of tasks accomplished and the conditions in which they were accomplished. Annotate results of the evaluation (mission ready/non mission ready). Trainee and supervisor initial in the remarks section.

3.10.3.2. Unsatisfactory Performance. A trainer or evaluator who is decertified, will not perform those duties until additional training or a requalification evaluation is successfully completed as appropriate.

3.10.4. AF Form 623a. The AF Form 623a is used to expand upon comments logged on the AF Form 803. The AF Form 623a is used for recommendations and explanation of restrictions or for recommendations for review board action. Use the AF Form 623a to record positive performance as well as negative. In order for the comments to be considered valid, the evaluator and trainees initials must be recorded after comments.

3.11. Unsatisfactory Performance During an Evaluation . If an evaluator observes a procedure that jeopardizes safety, they will immediately relieve the individual responsible and either appoint another qualified individual or assume the duties if qualified.

Chapter 4

REVIEW BOARDS

4.1. General. A review board is a panel of experienced senior operator personnel that evaluate qualifications of unit members who fail to meet prescribed standards. Review boards do not take the place of adequate training or documentation. When viewed as a whole, review boards are a part of the checks and balances used in the Stan/Eval program, albeit a last step. Review boards are designed to look at the overall process delivering an impartial judgment. Review boards not only look at the trainee, but at the training process to see if the failure is institutional or procedural. The primary evaluator will conduct the review board which consists of the operations officer or senior NCO (AFSC specific), the senior enlisted member, and the primary evaluator. If a board member cannot be present, the commander may designate an alternate. The individual's direct supervisor may observe the proceeding of the board, however, he is a nonvoting member. The commander may also observe the proceedings but is a nonvoting member as the board recommends action to the commander.

4.2. Review Board Actions. The board will evaluate and analyze all factors bearing on a situation and provide the commander with recommendations.

4.2.1. Convene a Review Board when:

4.2.1.1. Directed by the commander.

4.2.1.2. A member fails any requalification evaluation.

4.2.1.3. Any incident that compromised safety or resulted in injury to personnel or damage to equipment through negligence or violation of directives occurs.

4.2.2. The review board will determine the circumstances and adequacy of training and submit recommendations to the commander for further action. Recommendations may include removal of an advanced skill qualification, additional supervised training, or removal of the AFSC.

4.2.3. Actions resulting in the recommendation for removal of an AFSC will be forwarded to the next higher headquarters or MAJCOM level as appropriate.

Chapter 5

AFTER ACTION REVIEWS

5.1. General. An After Action Review (AAR) is a method of conducting continuous evaluation and improvement to equipment and procedures. It must be considered a way of life in the unit. An AAR is the basis for commanders and team leaders to assess unit capability and is used to provide feedback and solicit ideas to improve performance on unit METL.

5.1.1. The AAR consists of four parts. ([Attachment 2](#) is a sample after action).

5.1.1.1. Event Description.

5.1.1.2. Discussion. Explain desired objectives/goals.

5.1.1.3. Results. Describe actual events and accomplishments.

5.1.1.4. Recommended improvement areas.

5.1.1.5. Conclusions. Describe corrective actions that will be taken.

5.2. AAR Cross-Tell. To enhance unit effectiveness and continually improve training, headquarters use feedback from subordinate unit's AAR to distribute cross-tell. This allows adjustments in resources, personnel, training methods, and can be used to refine mission and standardize equipment and procedures among the force.

5.2.1. Unit Training Monitors. Consolidate lessons learned from AARs semi-annually, and upchannel reports to 720 STG/DOCV and MAJCOM functional manager if assigned to other than AFSOC.

5.2.2. 720th Special Tactics Group. Consolidate reports and disseminate semi-annually to all Special Tactics organizations.

5.2.3. Unit Level Consolidated Report Format. Unit reports consist of a discussion and recommendation for each of three areas: Trends, Tactics/Procedural Improvement, and Equipment Improvement. Each trend and/or improvement should be discussed and a recommendation provided.

MARVIN R. ESMOND, Lt Gen, USAF
DCS/Air and Space Operations

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAR—After Action Review

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFSC—Air Force Specialty Code

ANG—Air National Guard

ATC—Air Traffic Control

DOCV—Standards Division

HQ—Headquarters

IAW—In Accordance With

IG—Inspector General

LZ—Landing Zone

MAJCOM—Major Command

METL—Mission Essential Tasks List

OP—Observation Post

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

OJT—On-the-Job-Training

PT—Physical Training

Stan/Eval—Standards and Evaluation

STG—Special Tactics Group

TCS—Tasks, Conditions, and Standards

TM—Team Member

Terms

Certification—A formal indication of an individual's ability to perform a task to required standards.

Mission-ready—Synonymous with operationally ready, with respect to missions or functions performed in combat. (JP1-02)

Core Evaluations—Core evaluations consist of the closed book examination, physical training test (PT Test), and a team employment evaluation.

Evaluator—An individual who evaluates training and certifies qualifications or specific tasks.

Failure—An individual fails an evaluation when he is unable to satisfactorily complete any phase of an evaluation.

Initial Evaluation—An evaluation administered to personnel who have never been qualified combat ready IAW with this instruction and respective MAJCOM training directives.

Mission Essential Task List—An unconstrained statement of tasks required to complete wartime mission.

Nonmission-ready—A status resulting from failure during evaluation in items or events needed to perform the unit mission.

OJT—Individual training in designated job skills provided to individual members when serving in job positions in operational units. (AFDD 1-2)

Qualification Expiration—The date qualification expires. Normally the last day of month, 18 months from the last successful evaluation.

Recurring Evaluation—An evaluation administered within a specified period of time on a recurring basis (e.g. annually, semi-annually).

Requalification Evaluation—An evaluation required due to an unsatisfactory rating on a previous evaluation or an evaluation expiration.

Spot Evaluation—An evaluation given as a quality control measure to evaluate members on specific tasks or qualifications, but not to satisfy a recurring evaluation requirement.

Standard—An exact value, physical entity or abstract concept that authority, custom, or common consent sets up and defines to serve as a reference, model, or rule in measuring qualities or quantities, developing practices or procedures, or evaluation results. A fixed quality or quantity.

Tasks, Conditions, and Standards—A method of evaluating performance. Defines a specific task to be accomplished, the conditions the task is to be accomplished under, and the standard that is to be met for the task.

Trainee—An individual who is undergoing training.

Trainer—A trained and qualified person who teaches others to perform specific tasks.

Unit Stan/Eval Monitor—An individual appointed by the commander to oversee the standards and evaluation program.

Attachment 2**SAMPLE AFTER ACTION REPORT**

After Action Review - Oct 95 Event - Team Employment Evaluation

Objective - Conduct R&S of Field 21.

On 30 Sep 95, a training R&S mission was performed at Field 21. Team composition included a combat control 7-level Team Leader, a combat control 5-level, a combat control 3-level in upgrade training, and a 5-level pararescueman. Objective of the mission was to assess the field for landing of fixed wing airlift establishment of a casualty collection point for follow-on operations. Insertion was by MH-60 helicopter to a remote LZ. Team movement to the objective covered 10 kilometers over tropical scrub. Reconnaissance was by mechanical and electronic methods. Extraction was by MH-53. Total field time was approximately 72 hrs.

Remarks/Narration - Inserting by fastrope to a small LZ covered by thick brush, the rope appeared to rest on the ground when in fact it was resting on the scrub brush. This left a difference of three feet to the ground. On roping into the LZ, the first TM landed on the brush and turned an ankle. All others landed with no subsequent problems.

The TM with the ankle injury hampered movement to the objective. Although just out of school, the 3-level moved well with the team and used good patrolling techniques throughout the movement phase. One area of weakness, however, was that when assuming point the 3-level did not turn around often enough for directions from the TL.

Actions at the OP were routine with good security. The video transmitter failed on day 2 stopping video feed, all subsequent information was sent back by still-photo. (Additional info can be requested by secure methods.)

Extraction was executed in a satisfactory manner.

Conclusions - Ensure the ropemaster has a good visual on the area below the helo prior to roping. Allow adequate time for movement to an objective area. This is an important consideration when planning the operation. The ankle injury emphasized the need for planning a third to half again as much time. Also, adequate first aid capability or better must be available to ensure mission accomplishment. In the possibility the injury would have been debilitating, consider alternate plans for mission accomplishment. Electronic reconnaissance measures must be redundant to be effective. The TL must weigh the factors carefully when developing the plan. Individual on point must keep a constant watch to the front as well as to the rear.